

**Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2005**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated October 26, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) restricted claims 1-25 into two groups; 2) objected to the Declaration; 3) objected to the Abstract; 4) objected to claims 1, 9, 14 and 26 because of informalities; 5) rejected claims 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,868 ("Lie"); and 6) rejected claims 1-13 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,734,046 ("Dahl").

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 14, 19 and 26. Also, Applicants have withdrawn claims 21-25 and canceled claim 18. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner restricted the claims into claims 1-20 and 26-28 (group I) and claims 21-25 (group II). In this Office action response, Applicants elect to prosecute the claims of group I and withdraw the claims of group II. Applicants may choose to pursue the withdrawn claims in a continuation application.

II. OBJECTION TO DECLARATION

The Examiner objected to Applicants' Declaration and states "the name of inventor is misspelled." The Examiner's objection does not identify which inventor's name is misspelled and Applicants cannot find any misspelling as suggested by the Examiner.

III. OBJECTION TO ABSTRACT

The Examiner objected to Applicants' Abstract as lacking narrative format and as paraphrasing claim 1. Applicants amended the Abstract based on the information in MPEP 608.01(b) as requested by the Examiner.

IV. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 14 and 26 and states "the claims preamble must state the intended use or purpose of the invention." Applicants disagree and request that the Examiner cite authority to support the objection.

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2005

The Examiner objected to claim 9 and requested that "a router application" be changed to "the router application." In this Response, Applicants amended claim 9, replacing "a router application" with "the router application" to comply with the Examiner's request.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Amended claim 1 requires "[a] bump map application [that] displays a plurality of editable textual character groups representative of a plurality of bumps, the textual character groups are arranged on the GUI according to a relative coordinate position of the bumps with respect to an origin." Claim 1 further requires "a track definition application executed by the CPU, the track definition application displaying, on the GUI, a plurality of editable numeric parameters corresponding to tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer." Claim 1 further requires "[a] data extraction application automatically extracts data from the bump map application and the track definition application for use by a router application."

None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest both "a bump map application" and "a track definition application executed by [a] CPU" where "the track definition application display[s], on the GUI, a plurality of editable numeric parameters corresponding to tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer" and where "[a] data extraction application automatically extracts data from the bump map application and the track definition application for use by a router application." In Lie, routing rules are displayed and are used by a designer as a checklist (see Fig. 21 and col. 10, lines 40-50). Lie does not display "a plurality of editable numeric parameters corresponding to tracks of an integrated circuit metal layer" as required in claim 1. Furthermore, the routing rules in Lie are used by a designer as a checklist and are not "automatically extract[ed]...for use by a router application" as is required of the "data from...the track definition application". For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Amended claim 14 requires "determining if a macro defining a plurality of tracks exists". Claim 14 further requires "if a macro defining a plurality of tracks

Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2005

exists, extracting track parameters into the data structure based on the macro" and "if a macro defining a plurality of tracks does not exist, extracting track parameters into the data structure based on individual track definitions."

Lie does not clearly teach or suggest a "macro" as suggested by the Examiner (see Office action, page 9, paragraph 4). As described in claim 14 "a macro [defines] a plurality of tracks." As previously mentioned, the routing rules described in Lie are simply used by a designer as a checklist (see Fig. 21 and col. 10, lines 40-50). Even if Lie's routing rules were to be equated with Applicants' claimed "macro defining a plurality of track," Lie does not teach or suggest "if a macro defining a plurality of tracks exists, extracting track parameters into the data structure based on the macro" and "if a macro defining a plurality of tracks does not exist, extracting track parameters into the data structure based on individual track definitions" as required in claim 14. None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest the above limitations. For at least these reasons, claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Amended claim 26, in part, requires "means for editing bump labels by displaying straight-line connections between bumps and input/output circuitry prior to displaying tracks between the bumps and input/output circuitry." None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest this limitation. For at least this reason, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

**Appl. No. 10/735,549
Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2005**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400